UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

FILED IN CLERKS OFFICE

STEPHEN GILL and MICHELLE GILL, husband and wife,

CIVIL ACTION NO.5 DISTRICT COURSE

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Defendant.

RECEIPTRICI	CT COUR;
AMOUNT S	250.00
SUMMONS ISSU	JED <u>3</u>
LOCAL RULE 4.	
WAIVER FORM_	
MCF ISSUED	
BY DPTY CLK_	
DATE	16/05

### **COMPLAINT**

### **PARTIES**

MAGISTRATE JUDGE	7	لاس	7	len.	Jak
III (CIC III (I L. COP CIL.				J	J

- 1. Plaintiff Stephen Gill is a resident of Gulf Breeze, Santa Rosa County, Florida, and is a citizen of the United States.
- 2. Plaintiff Michelle Gill is a resident of Gulf Breeze, Santa Rosa County, Florida, and is a citizen of the United States.
- 3. Defendant United States of America is within the jurisdiction of this Court.

### **JURISDICTION**

- 4. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(b); 2401(b)-2402; 2671-2680, et seq. ("FTCA"), and all conditions precedent to Plaintiff Stephen Gill and Plaintiff Michelle Gill's right to bring this action have occurred or have been excused as hereinafter more fully appears.
- 5. At all material times relevant to the negligent acts or omissions and/or intentional acts or omissions of personnel of Naval Legal Services Command ("NLSC") and/or Naval Legal Service Office Central ("NLSO") acting within the scope of their office or employment with the Department of the Navy, an agency of Defendant United States of America, Plaintiffs Stephen

Gill and Michelle Gill were residents of South Weymouth, Norfolk County, Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

- The Commonwealth of Massachusetts is the place where the negligent acts or omissions 6. and/or intentional acts or omissions of personnel acting within the scope of their office or employment with the Department of the Navy, an agency of Defendant United States of America, occurred against Plaintiffs Stephen Gill and Michelle Gill.
- 7. The State of Florida is the place where Plaintiffs Stephen Gill and Michelle Gill suffered the harmful impact of the negligent acts or omissions and or intentional acts or omissions of personnel acting within the scope of their office or employment with the Department of the Navy, an agency of Defendant United States of America.
- Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1346(b), the entire substantive law of the Commonwealth of 8. Massachusetts applies to the instant civil action.
- There is no requirement that Plaintiffs Stephen Gill and Michelle Gill submit a claim to 9. the Secretary of Labor pursuant to Federal Employees' Compensation Act, 5 U.S.C. §§ 8101-8152, et seq. ("FECA"), before bringing their instant civil action against the Defendant United States of America under the FTCA.
- More than six (6) months before this action was instituted, the claim set forth herein was 10. presented to the Department of the Navy pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2675(a). Said agency having failed to make a final disposition of the claim within that time, Plaintiffs Stephen Gill and Michelle Gill deem such failure to be a denial thereof.

### **FACTS**

On or about February 22, 2002, personnel of NLSC and/or NLSO, including but not 11. limited to Commander Steven W. Bannow, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy ("CDR Bannow"), while acting in the course and scope of employment, reached out to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to solicit, recruit, and hire Plaintiff Stephen Gill, to serve as a Claims Attorney-Advisor for a two-year period with NLSO in Pensacola, Florida.

- 12. The soliciting, recruiting, and hiring of Plaintiff Stephen Gill was accomplished by personnel of NLSC and/or NLSO, including but not limited to CDR Bannow, in violation of Federal statutes, regulations, and/or agency guidelines, including but not limited to, 5 U.S.C. § 2302, and constituted prohibited personnel practices.
- 13. The soliciting, recruiting, and hiring of Plaintiff Stephen Gill by personnel of NLSC and/or NLSO, including but not limited to CDR Bannow, caused Plaintiff Stephen Gill to resign his lucrative position as an attorney in private practice in Boston, Massachusetts, to sell his family's home, to relocate his wife and two young children to the Pensacola, Florida area, and to move all of his family's belongings at his own expense.
- 14. The Claims Attorney-Advisor position with NLSO constituted nearly a thirty-percent (30%) per year pay cut for Plaintiff Stephen Gill, and did not afford him or his family any health insurance or other benefits whatsoever.
- 15. Plaintiff Stephen Gill commenced his first day of employment with NLSO on or about March 25, 2002. Within approximately forty-five (45) days thereafter, personnel of NLSC and/or NLSO, including but not limited to CDR Bannow, informed Plaintiff Stephen Gill that his position would conclude approximately one (1) month later, on June 30, 2002.
- 16. Under the circumstances, being informed by personnel of NLSC and/or NLSO, including but not limited to CDR Bannow, that his two-year position would terminate following only about ninety (90) days of employment proximately caused Plaintiff Stephen Gill to suffer severe emotional distress that a reasonable person would have suffered.

- 17. Plaintiff Stephen Gill's emotional distress manifested by objective symptomatology, including but not limited to stress and anxiety, fatigue, sleeplessness, feelings of despair, concentration problems, difficulty driving and working, reduced libido, and developing dysthymia.
- 18. Thereafter, in mid-June, 2002, personnel of NLSC and/or NLSO, including but not limited to CDR Bannow, informed Stephen Gill that his position would not terminate on June 30, 2002; but, rather, that he would remain employed until September 30, 2002.
- 19. In mid-September, 2002, personnel of NLSC and/or NLSO, including but not limited to CDR Bannow, informed Stephen Gill that his employment as a Claims Attorney-Advisor would not end on September 30, 2002, but would be extended until October 31, 2002.
- 20. By this time, Stephen Gill had accepted employment with a private law firm in Pensacola, Florida, and was to start work with that firm on November 1, 2002.
- 21. Thereafter, on or about October 29, 2002, personnel of NLSC and/or NLSO, including but not limited to CDR Bannow, again in violation of Federal statutes, regulations, and/or agency guidelines hired Stephen Gill to serve as a Legal Assistance Attorney-Advisor with NLSO for a six-month period.
- 22. This caused Stephen Gill to reject employment with the private law firm that had hired him to start work on November 1, 2002.
- 23. A short time later, around Christmas 2002, personnel of NLSC and/or NLSO, including but not limited to CDR Bannow, informed Stephen Gill that his position as a Legal Assistance Attorney-Advisor would conclude on January 11, 2002, and did conclude on that date.
- 24. Under the circumstances, being informed by personnel of NLSC and/or NLSO, including but not limited to CDR Bannow, that his Legal Assistance Attorney-Advisor position would

terminate following only about ninety (60) days of employment after inducing Plaintiff Stephen Gill to reject employment with a private law firm that had hired him to start work on November 1, 2002, proximately exacerbated Plaintiff Stephen Gill's severe emotional distress that a reasonable person would have suffered.

25. Plaintiff Stephen Gill's exacerbated emotional distress manifested by objective symptomatology, including but not limited to stress and anxiety, fatigue, sleeplessness, feelings of despair, concentration problems, difficulty driving and working, reduced libido, and dysthymia.

### **COUNT I – NEGLIGENT INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS**

- 26. Plaintiff Stephen Gill incorporates by reference all of the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 25 above as if fully set forth herein.
- 27. The aforesaid acts and/or omissions of Defendant United States of America, its agents, servants, or employees, acting within the scope of their office or employment, constituted negligence.
- 28. The aforesaid negligent acts and/or omissions of Defendant United States of America, its agents, servants, or employees, acting within the scope of their office or employment, did in fact proximately cause and also exacerbate Plaintiff Stephen Gill emotional distress as manifested by objective symptomatology, including but not limited to stress and anxiety, fatigue, sleeplessness, feelings of despair, concentration problems, difficulty driving and working, reduced libido, and developing dysthymia.
- 29. The aforesaid emotional injuries were caused solely by Defendant United States of America, its agents, servants, or employees, and without any negligence on the part of Plaintiff Stephen Gill contributing thereto.

Page 6 of 9

- As a result of the aforesaid negligent acts and/or omissions of Defendant United States of 30. America, its agents, servants, or employees, acting within the scope of their office or employment, Plaintiff Stephen Gill has suffered damages for his emotional distress and will continue to suffer similar damage in the future by reason of the possible permanency of his injuries, has incurred and continues to incur expenses for medical attention and treatment, including but not limited to costs of antidepressant and anxiety medications required to treat his emotional distress, to Plaintiff Stephen Gill's detriment and damage in the sum of Seven-Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$750,000.00).
- Under the circumstances, a reasonable person would have suffered emotional distress. 31.
- If Defendant United States of America were a private person, it would be liable to 32. Plaintiff Stephen Gill in accordance with the law of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Stephen Gill demands judgment against the Defendant United States of America in the sum of Seven-Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$750,000.00), plus costs, and such other relief as this Court deems just.

## COUNT II -INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

- Plaintiff Stephen Gill incorporates by reference all of the allegations set forth in 33. paragraphs 1 through 32 above as if fully set forth herein.
- The aforesaid acts and/or omissions of Defendant United States of America, its agents, 34. servants, or employees, acting within the scope of their office or employment, were intended to inflict emotional distress, or Defendant United States of America, its agents, servants, or employees knew or should have known that emotional distress was the likely result of their aforesaid conduct under the circumstances.

6

- 35. Under the circumstances, the aforesaid conduct of Defendant United States of America, its agents, servants, or employees, acting within the scope of their office or employment, was extreme and outrageous, was beyond all possible bounds of decency, and was utterly intolerable in a civilized community.
- 36. The aforesaid acts and/or omissions of Defendant United States of America, its agents, servants, or employees, acting within the scope of their office or employment, caused and also exacerbated Plaintiff Stephen Gill's emotional distress.
- 37. The emotional distress sustained by Plaintiff Stephen Gill, including but not limited to stress and anxiety, fatigue, sleeplessness, feelings of despair, concentration problems, difficulty driving and working, reduced libido, and developing dysthymia, was and is severe and of a nature that no reasonable man could be expected to endure.
- 38. The aforesaid emotional injuries were caused solely by Defendant United States of America, its agents, servants, or employees, and without any negligence on the part of Plaintiff Stephen Gill contributing thereto.
- 39. As a result of the aforesaid conduct of Defendant United States of America, its agents, servants, or employees, acting within the scope of their office or employment, Plaintiff Stephen Gill has suffered damages for his emotional distress and will continue to suffer similar damage in the future by reason of the possible permanency of his injuries, has incurred and continues to incur expenses for medical attention and treatment, including but not limited to costs of antidepressant and anxiety medications required to treat his emotional distress, to Plaintiff Stephen Gill's detriment and damage in the sum of Seven-Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$750,000.00).

Page 8 of 9

If Defendant United States of America were a private person, it would be liable to 40. Plaintiff Stephen Gill in accordance with the law of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Stephen Gill demands judgment against the Defendant United States of America in the sum of Seven-Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$750,000.00), plus costs, and such other relief as this Court deems just.

## COUNT III - LOSS OF CONSORTIUM, SERVICE, AND MARITAL SOCIETY

- Plaintiff Michelle Gill incorporates by reference all of the allegations set forth in 41. paragraphs 1 through 40 above as if fully set forth herein.
- As a result of the aforesaid negligent and/or intentional acts and/or omissions of 42. Defendant United States of America, its agents, servants, or employees, acting within the scope of their office or employment, Plaintiff Michelle Gill, as the lawfully wedded wife of Plaintiff Stephen Gill, was deprived of the service, society, and consortium to which she was entitled as his wife, and will continue to suffer similar damage in the future by reason of the possible permanency of his injuries, to Plaintiff Michelle Gill's detriment and damage in the sum of Three-Hundred Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars (\$375,000.00).
- The aforesaid emotional injuries to Plaintiff Stephen Gill and the aforesaid loss of 43. consortium and marital society and service suffered by Plaintiff Michelle Gill were caused solely by Defendant United States of America, its agents, servants, or employees, and without any negligence on the part of Plaintiffs Stephen Gill or Michelle Gill contributing thereto.
- 44. If Defendant United States of America were a private person, it would be liable to Plaintiffs Stephen Gill and Michelle Gill in accordance with the law of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff Michelle Gill demands judgment against the Defendant United States of America in the sum of Three-Hundred Seventy-Five Thousand Dollars (\$375,000.00), plus costs, and such other relief as this Court deems just.

> Plaintiffs, By their attorney,

KRISTEN K. M. MATERNE

Law Office of Timothy J. Morgan 33 College Hill Road, Suite 15G

Warwick, RI 02886 Tel.: (401) 826-3344 Fax: (401) 826-0444

SJS 44 (Rev. 11/04)

## CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Cierk of Court for the purpose of initiating PLAINTIFFS

DEFENDANTS

DEFENDANTS

DEFENDANTS

(b) County of Reside  (c) Attorney's (Firm National Residence)  Kristen Materne, Esq.	fichelle T. Gill, as husb ence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFE		DEFENDAN United States	TS Of America	CLERKS OFFICE
(b) County of Reside  (c) Attorney's (Firm National Residence)  Kristen Materne, Esq.	ence of First Listed Plaintiff		United States	of America	The state of LICE
(c) Attorney's (Finn Not Kristen Materne, Esq.	ence of First Listed Plaintiff (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIF	M- Cu ~			
(c) Attorney's (Finn Not Kristen Materne, Esq.	(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIF.				
Kristen Materne, Esq.		Norfolk County, N	MA To make Reside	nce of Fire Lated $Q_{cool}$	The Bral both A-14.
Kristen Materne, Esq.		r (ASES)		(INT'S PARTITION	S VI CAL
Ansten Materne, Esq.			NOTE: IN	LAND CONDEMNATION d Las	SES ONLY S. LIST STERMONTION OF THE S.T. P.L. C.T. P.C. T. P.C
Ansien Materne, Esq.			LA	ND INVOLVED.	S. Lat 2-tely 6 Lich On Office
Kristen Materne, Esq.	ame, Address, and Telephone Nu	mber)	1	U (	STRICT OF MASS.
100000000000000000000000000000000000000	33 College Hill Road	Suite 15C Warris	Attorneys (If Kno	wn)	
		ounce 150, warwick,	US Attorney, O	ne Court House Way, Be	Octon MA 02210
II. BASIS OF JURIS	SDICTION (Place on ")	(" in One Box Only)			
☐ 1 U.S. Government		. In One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP O	F PRINCIPAL PARTI	ES(Place an "X" in One Box for Pla
Plaintiff	3 Federal Question		(For Diversity Cases On	ly)	C.S(Place an "X" in One Box for Pla
	(U.S. Governme	ent Not a Party)	Citizen of This State	PTF DEF	and One Box for Defendant)  PTF DE
2 U.S. Government	<b>3</b>			of Business In	r Principal Place
Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity	ľ	Citizen of Another State	_	
	(Indicate Citizer	nship of Parties in Item III)	Another State	1 2	od Principal Place 5 5
		,	Civi o a c	of Business	In Another State
IV. NATURE OF SU	IT (D)		Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	☐ 3 ☐ 3 Foreign Nation	J 6 D 6
CONTRACT	III OILE DOX (				
110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	ORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	RANEDVIDO	
D 120 Marine D 130 Miller Act	I∟J 310 Aimlane	PERSONAL INJURY  362 Personal Injury	5 610 Agriculture	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	315 Airplane Product	Med. Maloractice	☐ 620 Other Food & Davis	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal	☐ 400 State Reapportionment
-J 130 Recovery of Overnayment	Liability 320 Assault, Libel &	J 365 Personal Injury	625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	20 110	3 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking
& Enforcement of Judgmen  151 Medicare Act	t Slander	Product Liability	1-2 030 (1000r Lauce	PROPERTY	I □ 450 Commerce
152 Recovery of Defaulted	330 Federal Employers	368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product	J 440 R R & Truck	PROPERTY RIGHTS  1 820 Copyrights	■ 3 460 Deportation
Student Loans	Liability ☐ 340 Marine	Liability	650 Airline Reus. 660 Occupational	I □ 830 Patent	☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced and
(Excl. Veterans)	345 Marine Product	PERSONAL PROPERT	Y J Safety/Health	☐ 840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations  480 Consumer Credit
J 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability	371 Truth in Lending	90 Other		1 □ 490 Cable/Sat TV
J. 160 Stockholders' Suita	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle		10 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY	310 Selective Service
J 190 Other Contract	Product Liability	Property Damage	J Act	□ 86 H(A (1395ff)	850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	360 Other Personal	385 Property Damage Product Liability	720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	☐ 875 Customer Challenge
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS		-30 Labor/Mgmt Reporting	T□ 804 SS(D Titla V)/1	12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions
210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure	□ 441 Voting	PRISONER PETITIONS	_J □ 740 Railway Labor Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	I - 921 Agricultural Acto
330 5 .	442 Employment	☐ 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	790 Other Labor Litigation	FEDERAL TAX SUITS  870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	J □ 892 Economic Stabilization A
Z4U Lorfs to Land	1 443 Housing/	Habeas Cornus	□ /91 Empl. Ret. Inc.	or Defendant)	I □ 023 EffViConmental Mass
245 Fort Product Liability	Accommodations  ☐ 444 Welfare	J 530 General	Security Act	☐ 871 IRSThird Party	894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information
290 All Other Real Property	3 445 Amer. w/Disabilities -	535 Death Penalty 540 Mandamus & Other	}	26 USC 7609	I Act
1	Employment	I-J 550 Civil Riohte			900Appeal of Fee Determination
	Other	☐ 555 Prison Condition	J ,	l	Under Equal Access to Justice
I	1 440 Other Civil Rights		ł.		☐ 950 Constitutionality of
OBIGIN			L i		State Statutes
(Trace a)	"X" in One Box Only)				
n- Comp	moved from	Remanded from 3 4	Reinstated on D 5 Transfe	erred from	Appeal to District
318		mmall-4 O			☐ 7 Judge from
CAUSE OF ACTION	. Federal Court C	ite under which you are fil	ing (Do not cite jurisdictions)	Litigation	Magistrate Judgment
SHOOL OF ACTION	Brief description of caus	/ NOL 20 USU S	Reopened (specifing 1967); 2401(b); 2401(b); 2401(c)	2, 20/1-2680 et sen	
	Timoritional and fit	egligent infliction of	emotional distress and		
PEOUECTER	CHECK IF THIS IS	A CLASS ACTION	DEMAND \$	loss of consortium	
. REQUESTED IN	I II I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I		5,000.00	CHECK YES only if	demanded in complaint:
. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	OMDEKTRUCTOR		5,000.00	JURY DEMAND:	Yes No
COMPLAINT:  I. RELATED CASE(S	S)		<del></del>		
. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: I. RELATED CASE(SIF ANY	(See instructions):	IDGE			
COMPLAINT: I. RELATED CASE(S IF ANY	(See instructions):	UDGE		DOCKET NUMBER	
COMPLAINT:  I. RELATED CASE(S	(See instructions):		'EY OF RECORD	DOCKET NUMBER	
COMPLAINT:  I. RELATED CASE(S  IF ANY	(See instructions):	UDGE SIGNATURE OF ATTORN	EY OF RECORD	DOCKET NUMBER	
COMPLAINT:  I. RELATED CASE(S  IF ANY	(See instructions):		EY OF RECORD	DOCKET NUMBER	=======
COMPLAINT:  I. RELATED CASE(S IF ANY  OFFICE USE ONLY CEIPT #	S) (See instructions): 現		EY OF RECORD	DOCKET NUMBER	
COMPLAINT:  I. RELATED CASE(S  IF ANY	S) (See instructions): 現		YEY OF RECORD  JUDGE	DOCKET NUMBER	

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

ν.	. Title of case	se (name of first party on each side only) Stephen D. Gill, et al v United States of AnjeticaE []	
2.		IN OUR OF	FICE
2,	Category in		
	local rule 40	40.1(a)(1)).   2005 FEB 16 A	e Tí: Icla
	i I.	160, 410, 470, R.23, REGARDLESS OF NATURE OF SUIT.	11. 44
	U.	195, 368, 400, 440, 441-444, 540, 550, 555, 625, 710, 720, 730, 740, 790, 791, 820*, 830*, 840*, 850, 890, 892-894, 895, 950.	ASS.
	<u>                                     </u>	110, 120, 130, 140, 151, 190, 210, 230, 240, 245, 250, 310, 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 355, 360, 362, 360, 371, 380, 385, 450, 891.	III N
	IV.	220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 510, 530, 610, 620, 630, 640, 650, 660, 690, 810, 861-865, 870, 871, 875, 900.	The state of the s
	٧.	150, 152, 153.	
3.	Title and num		
	this district ple	nber, if any, of related cases. (See local rule 40.1(g)). If more than one prior related case has been filed in lease indicate the title and number of the first filed case in this court.	
4.	Has a prior act	ction between the same parties and based on the same claim ever been filed in this court?	
5.		plaint in this case question the constitutionality of an act of congress affecting the public interest? (See	
	If so, is the U.S.	S.A. or an officer, agent or employee of the U.S. a party?	
6.	is this case requ	YES NO Juired to be heard and determined by a district court of three judges pursuant to title 28 USC §2284?	
		Sy a district court of three judges pursuant to title 28 USC §2284?	
7.	Do <u>all</u> of the part Massachusetts (* 40.1(d)).	YES NO  rties in this action, excluding governmental agencies of the united states and the Commonwealth of ("governmental agencies"), residing in Massachusetts reside in the same division? - (See Local Rule	
	A.	If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside?	
		Central Division Western Division	
	В.	If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside?	
		Eastern Division Central Division	
if y	f filing a Notice of es, submit a sepa	of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If	
	TYPE OR PRINT)	Services de	
TORNE	Y'S NAME Kriste	ten Materne, Esg.	
DRESS	33 College H	Hill Road, Suite 15G, Warwick, RI 02886	
	NE NO(401)82		